REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action dated April 4, 2006, claims 1 – 7 and 16 – 19 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6, 16, 17, 18, and 20 – 24. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Claims 1 – 7 and 16 – 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ash et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,778,535, hereinafter Ash) further in view of Seddigh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,973,035, hereinafter Seddigh).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to further specify that the plurality of traffic paths through the at least one transport network are "different" paths through the network and to emphasis throughout the claim that the traffic paths are traffic paths which are "through said at least one transport network." As amended claim 1 recites:

> "A method comprising:
> routing a set-up message to a plurality of nodes in at least one transport network, wherein said set-up message reserves network resources for ***a plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network*** as said set-up message visits each of said plurality of nodes; and
> routing said set-up message to said plurality of nodes in said transport network, wherein said set-up message provisions said reserved network resources for ***said plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network*** as said set-up message revisits each of said plurality of nodes;
> wherein the reserved network resources are provisioned only if all of the resources needed for the plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network have been successfully reserved."

Support for the claim amendments is provided, for example, in Applicants' specification at page 7, lines 8 – 17 and Fig. 6.

Claim 1 is rejected under the logic that Ash teaches all of the limitations of claim 1 except for the limitation of provisioning reserved network resources "only if all of the resources needed for the plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one

transport network have been successfully reserved." Seddigh is cited for teaching the above-cited limitation. Applicants assert that claim 1 is not obvious from Ash in view of Seddigh for the following reasons:

Ash does not teach or suggest reserving resources "for a plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network"

Claim 1 recites in part "wherein said set-up message reserves network resources for a plurality of ***different*** traffic paths ***through said at least one transport network***." That is, claim 1 recites that the reserved network resources are related to ***different*** traffic paths ***through*** at least one transport network. For example, referring to pg. 7, lines 8 – 17 and Fig. 6 of Applicants' specification, ***different*** traffic paths ***through*** said at least one transport network are the path that goes from node 301-8 to node 301-2 via nodes 301-11 and 301-6 and the path that goes from node 301-8 to node 301-2 via node 301-3.

In contrast to claim 1, Ash teaches reserving resources for only one path through a transport network (e.g., path A or path B, Fig. 2). If the resources for a first path (e.g., path A) cannot be reserved, then the resources of a second path (e.g., path B) are checked. This path-by-path process continues until a single path is reserved. In particular, at col. 3, lines 33 – 44, Ash teaches:

> "As seen in FIG. 2, the shortest multi hop path is selected, which as seen in FIG. 2 comprises path A that passes through via nodes 6 and 5 before reaching destination node 4. Having selected Path A, the origin node checks whether available bandwidth exists for the Class-of-Service of the call on the link from node 1 to node 6. If so, then node 6 looks for available bandwidth on the link to node 5 in a similar manner. In turn, via node 5 looks for available bandwidth on the link to the destination node 4 in a similar manner. The search depth passes from each node to a successive downstream path in the set-up message. If any node along the selected path ascertains that an intermediate link, for example, the link between nodes 5 and 4, lacks sufficient bandwidth, then a crankback is sent back to the originating node 1 to select another path. The originating node 1 then selects the next shortest path, say path B in FIG. 2, and repeats the above-described process." (emphasis added)

That is, Ash teaches reserving resources for only one path, specifically, the first path that has sufficient resources. Because Ash does not teach or suggest reserving resources "for

a plurality of different traffic paths through the at least one transport network," Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been established.

Ash does not teach or suggest a set-up message that provisions reserved resources as the set-up message revisits nodes

Claim 1 recites in part that the "set-up message provisions said reserved network resources for said plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network as said set-up message revisits each of said plurality of nodes." That is, the set-up message provisions traffic path as it revisits nodes.

In contrast to claim 1, Ash teaches that a "crankback message" is sent back to the originating node in the case where sufficient network resources are not available on the instant path and as such cannot be reserved or provisioned. At col. 3, lines 26 – 31, Ash teaches:

> "If any node along the selected path ascertains that an intermediate link, for example, the link between nodes 5 and 4, lacks sufficient bandwidth, then a crankback is sent back to the originating node 1 to select another path. The originating node 1 then selects the next shortest path, say path B in Fig. 2, and repeats the above-described process."

At col. 5, lines 35 – 53, Ash again teaches that the crankback message is used in the case where network resources are not available and as such cannot be reserved or provisioned.

In sum, claim 1 recites that a set-up message provisions reserved resources as the set-up message revisits nodes while Ash teaches that a crankback message is sent back to an originating node in the case where resources cannot be reserved or provisioned. Because claim 1 recites a message that revisits nodes to provision resources while Ash teaches a message that revisits nodes only when resources cannot be provisioned, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Seddigh does not teach or suggest provisioning reserved resources "only if all of the resources needed for the plurality of different traffic paths through said at least one transport network have been successfully reserved"

Claim 1 recites in part "wherein the reserved network resources are provisioned only if all of the resources needed for the plurality of ***different*** traffic paths ***through*** said at least one transport network have been successfully reserved." That is, all of the resources needed for ***multiple different traffic paths through a transport network*** must be successfully reserved before the resources are provisioned.

In contrast to claim 1, Seddigh teaches how to reserve resources for only a single path. Although the connection is a two-way connection, Seddigh teaches that the resources are reserved for only a single path, in particular, the path between the sender (310) and the receiver (320), see Fig. 3. As illustrated in Fig. 3 of Seddigh, the single path between the sender (310) and the receiver (320) runs through devices $E_1 - E_8$. Because Seddigh is only concerned with one path through the network (the path between the sender (310) and the receiver (320)), the limitation of provisioning resources only if all of the resources ***for multiple different paths through a transport network*** were successfully reserved is not applicable to Seddigh.

In sum, both Ash and Seddigh relate to reserving and provisioning resources for a single path, for example, the path between the origin and the destination (as taught by Ash) or the path between the sender and the receiver (as taught by Seddigh). In contrast to Ash and Seddigh, claim 1 is specific to provisioning resources for ***multiple different paths through a network*** only if all of the necessary resources have been previously reserved. For the above cited reasons, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claims 2 – 7

Because claims 2 through 7 depend on claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable based on an allowable claim 1.

Claims 16 – 19

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite similar limitations to amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claims 1 and 16 Applicants assert that the remarks provided above with respect to claim 1 apply also to claim 16. Because claims 17 through 19 depend on claim 16, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable based on an allowable claim 16.

Claims 20 – 23

Claims 20 and 22 are similar to claims 1 and 16, respectively. Because of the similarities between claims 1 and 16 Applicants assert that the remarks provided above with respect to claim 1 apply also to claims 20 and 22. Because claims 21 and 23 depend on claims 20 and 22, respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable based on an allowable base claim.

Claims 24 – 27

Independent claim 24 has been amended to recite similar limitations to amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claims 1 and 24 Applicants assert that the remarks provided above with respect to claim 1 apply also to claim 24. Because claims 25 through 27 depend on claim 24, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable based on an allowable claim 24.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2006

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111